arXiv:1510.04550v2 [q-fin.EC] 17 Mar 2016

Dynamics and Stability in Retail Competition

Marcelo J. Villena and Axel A. Araneda*

March 18, 2016

Faculty of Engineering & Sciences, Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez
Avda. Diagonal las Torres 2640, Peñalolén, 7941169, Santiago, Chile.

Retail competition today can be described by three main features: i) oligopolistic competition, ii) multi-store settings, and iii) the presence of large economies of scale. In these markets, firms usually apply a centralized decisions making process in order to take full advantage of economies of scales, e.g. retail distribution centers. In this paper, we model and analyze the stability and chaos of retail competition considering all these issues. In particular, a dynamic multi-market Cournot-Nash equilibrium with global economies and diseconomies of scale model is developed. We confirm the non-intuitive hypothesis that retail multi-store competition is more unstable that traditional small business that cover the same demand. The main sources of stability are the scale parameter and the number of markets.

Keywords: Multi-market Oligopoly, Cournot-Nash competition, Economies of Scale, Stability, Bifurcations, and Chaos.

1 Introduction

In an oligopolistic setting under a Cournot scheme [1], the strategy of each economic player depends on its own quantity decision, and on its rival's reaction. Puu was the first to explicitly show the complex dynamics of the oligopolistic setting under simple assumptions (isoelastic demand function and constant marginal cost) for two and three players [2–4]. This kind of analysis has grown significantly during the last decade in both, the mathematics and complex systems literature, as well as in the economically-oriented journals.

Indeed, since the Puu's approach, several games has been developed for the study of the market stability, focusing on: different demand or price function [5, 6], number of players [7, 8], behavioral assumptions (naive [9–11], versus adaptive [12, 13], bounded rationality [6, 14, 15] or heterogeneous expectations [16–19]). In terms of the cost function definition, several developments has been proposed as well, as non-linear cost function [6, 13, 15, 19, 20], capacity constraints |[13, 21–23] and some spillover effects [24–27].

*Email: axel.araneda@uai.cl, Tel.: +56 2 23311416

Most works in this line of research have concentrated in single markets with linear production structures (i.e. assuming constant returns to scale). Nevertheless, oligopolistic competition today seems to present multi-market phenomena and, in some cases, they showcase important economies of scale, especially in the retail industry. Indeed, supermarket chains and retailers of food, gasoline, supplies and services all compete for market share through multi-store formats over geographically separated markets. This localized competition is presented in different levels: city, region, or country. In this context, companies segment their strategies, tailoring their selected outcome for different types of consumers and competitors, which vary by geographical location. On the other hand, on the supply side, multi-market retailers usually try to take full advantages of their size, in other words, their economies of scale. For instance, through the development of distributions centers that attend most of the stores in an specific territory. Thus, as the cost structure of multi-market retails depends on the total volume of the produced goods, the individual cost structure of each store is usually coupled with the whole business. It is important to point out that, this system of production, implies a centralized decisions making process, which become in practice an extremely difficult task. Summing up, retail competition today can be described by three main features: i) oligopolistic competition, ii) multi-store setting, iii) the presence of economies of scale.

Applications of the Cournot scheme into the multi-market problem has been proposed before by economists, for example, in the case of international trade. Some of these works modeled the presence of economies of scale, for the domestic and foreign markets, considering the size (quantity produced) and other properties of firms [28–35]. Thus, for instance in a work of Krugman [30], a multi-market Cournot model with economies of scale was used to explain the successful performance of Japan as an exporting country at the beginning of the 1980s.

In theoretical terms, the multi-market oligopoly framework was revisited and generalized in the seminal paper by Bulow, Geanakoplos and Klemperer [36]. One of their main remarks is that the presence of a multi-store firm in a market may affect the position in the others for the presence of demand and/or supply spillovers. In the same line, Bernheim and Whinston, [37], show that with scale economies, the multi-market contact may produce "spheres of influence" [38], that occurs when each of the multi-market competing firms may be more efficient in some subset of these markets and less efficient in others (symmetric advantage) or when one firm is more efficient in all markets (absolute advantage). Despite these multi-market analysis, this literature has focused mainly on the demand side of the problem, not the supply side. Specifically, they refer to multi-market contact, when demands curves recognize substitution and complementarity of different products.

In terms of the analysis of the dynamics of the multi-market Cournot problem, we found only a few papers [39–42], focusing on different products and scope.

In this context, this research deals with the analysis of stability and chaos of multi-market competition in the presence of economies and diseconomies of scale, extending this way the analysis of the dynamics of the oligopolistic competition. Thus, we model the main characteristics of the retail competition today, analysing the dynamics and stability of this particular dynamic system, and we compare these results with the stability analysis of traditional small business that cover the same demand, the classic Pu's formulation.

The main hypothesis of the paper is that non-linear cost structures in multi-market setting are important sources of instability in the game outcome. Particularly, we study

the stability of a multi-market Cournot-Nash equilibrium with global economies of scale, that is, the scale level that is related to the total production of firms, in all markets, as opposed to local economies of scale presented at each store individually or linear production structures. In this setting, the internal organization of a firm may affect its performances over the markets and the global equilibrium [43]. For example, multi-market firms that buy their products in a centralized manner, storing them in a distribution center, to be redistributed afterwards to their retailers store in all markets usually operate this way to obtain economies of scale in the process of buying and distribution. In this paper, we assume this type of centralized structure where companies takes advantage of their size, under economies of scale, that allow them to decrease the cost structure [44].

This papers is organized as follows: in section 2 classical models of the Cournot problem are described and extended to the multi-market framework. In the section 3 a Multi-market-Cournot problem is presented, considering interrelated cost structures and economies of scale. In section 4, the study of the stability of the system is addressed and generalized for the duopoly case. In the fifth section, the complex dynamics of the game for different numbers markets and values of the scale parameter are shown by path graphics and bifurcation diagrams. Finally, the main conclusions for this work are presented.

2 Baseline: Single market oligopoly models

The well-known Cournot-Theocharis model [45–48] proposed a Cournot Oligopoly model with inverse lineal demand function and constant marginal cost, that is:

$$P = a - \sum q^i \tag{2.1}$$

$$C^i = c^i q^i \tag{2.2}$$

where $i = 1, \ldots, N$ identify the player, P is the price of the good, C is the total cost and q is the quantity.

The profit is obtained subtracting the revenues by total cost:

$$\pi^i = q^i P\left(q^1, \ldots, q^N\right) - c^i q^i$$

The optimization problem (maximization of profit) arrives to:

$$\overset{*}{q^i} = \frac{a - c^i}{2} - \sum_{k \neq i} \frac{q^k}{2} \tag{2.3}$$

With solution (Cournot-Nash equilibrium point):

$$\overset{*}{q^i} = \frac{a - c^i + N\left(\bar{c} - c^i\right)}{N + 1}$$

with $\bar{c} = (1/N)\sum_i c^i$

In order to transform the static game 2.3 into a dynamic one, the Cournot or naive strategy is used (see Cournot [1] and Puu [2])[1]. Thus, the long run map as an iterative process is given by:

$$q^i(t+1) = \frac{a - c^i}{2} - \sum_{k \neq i} \frac{q^k(t)}{2} \tag{2.4}$$

The dynamical system of N reaction functions defined by 2.4 has a stable equilibrium (fix point) for $n \leq 2$. For $n = 3$ the equilibrium is neutrally stable (stationary oscillations) and for $n \geq 4$ the equilibrium becomes unstable.

A generalization of the Cournot-Theocharis problem was developed by Fisher [49]. This research allows to work with increasing or decreasing returns to scale (i.e., economies or diseconomies of scale). In order to get this result, we need to add a non-linear term to the traditional linear cost function:

$$\begin{aligned} P &= a - \sum_i q^i \\ C^i &= c^i q^i + d\left(q^i\right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the profit takes the following form:

$$\pi^i = q^i P\left(q^1, \ldots, q^N\right) - c^i q^i - d\left(q^i\right)^2 \tag{2.5}$$

Some restrictions for avoiding non-negativity of outputs, price, profits and marginal cost are considered: $c > 0$, $a \geq c$ and $d > -1/2$.

Thus, the maximization of the profit (eq. 2.5) leads to the best response of the i^{th}-firm:

$$\overset{*}{q}{}^i = \frac{a - \sum_{k \neq i} q^k - c^i}{2\left(1 + d\right)} \tag{2.6}$$

Then, the Cournot-Nash equilibrium is given by:

[1] In this strategy, it is assumed that a player at time of the decision making process, it takes into account the rival's previous output, e.g, managers use past information and supposes it doesn't change at this moment.

$$\frac{\left(a-c^i\right)(1+2d)+N\left(\bar{c}-c^i\right)}{4d^2+2(N+2)d+N+1}$$

Hence, the naive dynamics takes the form:

$$q^i(t+1)=\frac{a-\sum_{k\neq i}q^k(t)-c^i}{2(1+d)} \tag{2.7}$$

Finally, this dynamical system becomes stable when $(N-3)/2 < d$. Thus, if there are two players the game has a stable equilibrium if $d > -1/2$.

The approaches revised above (Teocharis and Fisher), were design to model a single-market oligopoly problem (for example the rivalry between "mom-and-pop" stores). In this case, both the prices and the costs don't depends upon the behavior of the players in other markets, because they did not consider the case of large corporations, with multiple operations in various locations.

In the next section, and taking as baseline the models presented above, we will develop a multi-market Cournot model with economies of scale that will allow us to describe the modern retail competition.

3 The Model

Let us consider a multi-market oligopoly where N single-product firms compete in M markets. All markets are very far away, so there not exist arbitrage possibilities. Each market has its own price (from a linear demand function). Then, if q_j^i is the quantity of the i^{th} company at the market j and Q_j the market supply, the selling price at the j^{th} market is given by,

$$P_j = a_j - \sum_i q_j^i = a_j - Q_j \tag{3.1}$$

We assume a centralized managerial structure, where the production costs depends of the total outputs of each firm. Besides, due both their size and specialization the company can have economies of scale. So we have:

$$C^i = c^i \sum_j q_j^i + d\left(\sum_j q_j^i\right)^2 = c^i Q^i + d\left(Q^i\right)^2 \tag{3.2}$$

with c^i greater than zero. Depending of the value of d the companies operates under economies of scale ($d < 0$) or diseconomies of scale ($d > 0$). The allowable range for the parameter d will be analyzed later.

The square form of the production cost was used previously for other scholars in a single-market context [6, 49–51]. However, for this multi-market scheme we use the non-linearity for to couple the costs and to enable the existence of economies (diseconomies) of scale. This is a realistic approach for the retails firms, because they produce or buy in large scale.

Under this cost structure, $c^i > 0$ and $dQ^i_{max} > -c^i/2$, where Q^i_{max} is the maximum level of production of firm i. The theoretical maximum production (extreme case) is achieved when a company becomes a monopoly in all the markets (i.e. $Q_j = q^i_j, \forall j$). As $P_j \geq 0$, we have $\sum_j a_j > Q^i_{max}$, and then we have $2d > c^i / \sum_j a_j$.

Thus the profit function of each firm depends upon each market price, the quantity sold by the firm in that particular market, and the total cost of the firm, that considers the sum of the global cost and the local cost:

$$\pi^i = \sum_j q^i_j P_j - C^i \tag{3.3}$$

$$= \sum_j q^i_j \left(a_j - b_j \sum_i q^i_j \right) - c^i Q^i - d \left(Q^i \right)^2 \tag{3.4}$$

The managerial decision of each firm is to choose the quantity q^i_j that maximizes its profits. In other words, the i^{th} company which produces a total output of Q^i divided over the M different markets according to the output vector $\underline{Q^i} = \left\{ q^i_1, q^i_2, \ldots, q^i_M, \right\}$ needs to fix the optimal allocation given by $\overset{*}{\underline{Q}}{}^i = \left\{ \overset{*}{q}{}^i_1, \overset{*}{q}{}^i_2, \ldots, \overset{*}{q}{}^i_M \right\}$, where each one of the $\overset{*}{q}{}^i_j$ is a solution of the $M \times N$ simultaneous equations which comprising the first order conditions of this game given by:

$$\frac{\partial \pi^i}{\partial q^i_j} = a_j - Q_j - q^i_j - c^i - 2dQ^i = 0 \tag{3.5}$$

Defining the residual market supply for i as $\tilde{Q}^i_j = Q_j - q^i_j$, and the participation of the firm i in other markets different to j as $\hat{Q}^i_j = Q^i - q^i_j$, the equilibrium quantity take the value:

$$\overset{*}{q}{}^i_j = \frac{a_j - \tilde{Q}^i_j - c^i - 2d\hat{Q}^i_j}{2\left(1 + d\right)} \tag{3.6}$$

Clearly, the allocation decision depends on the decision of the other players on this market, and also depends on the participation of the firm in other markets (or the total firm supply). This results is consistent with the Cournot intuition and consistent to previous results for the single-market problem[2] [20, 49, 52].

[2] When $\tilde{Q}^i = 0$

In order to keep the game on rails, we have that $\overset{*}{q}{}_j^i$ is a maximum if and only if $d > -1$. Also the marginal profit for zero output must be non-negative [49], so $a_j \geq c^i, \forall i$. This conditions joined with the previous restrictions arrives to:

$$d > -\frac{1}{2m} \tag{3.7}$$

The profit of each firm at the equilibrium point is given by:

$$\pi^i = \sum_j \left(\overset{*}{q}{}_j^i\right)^2 + d\left(\sum_j \overset{*}{q}{}_j^i\right)^2 \tag{3.8}$$

The Jacobian matrix at the equilibrium is given by:

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \overset{*}{\underline{Q}}{}^1}{\partial \underline{Q}^1} & \frac{\partial \overset{*}{\underline{Q}}{}^1}{\partial \underline{Q}^2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \overset{*}{\underline{Q}}{}^1}{\partial \underline{Q}^N} \\ \frac{\partial \overset{*}{\underline{Q}}{}^2}{\partial \underline{Q}^1} & \frac{\partial \overset{*}{\underline{Q}}{}^2}{\partial \underline{Q}^2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \overset{*}{\underline{Q}}{}^2}{\partial \underline{Q}^N} \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial \overset{*}{\underline{Q}}{}^N}{\partial \underline{Q}^1} & \frac{\partial \overset{*}{\underline{Q}}{}^N}{\partial \underline{Q}^2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \overset{*}{\underline{Q}}{}^N}{\partial \underline{Q}^N} \end{bmatrix} \tag{3.9}$$

where each one of the $N \times N$ entries of J is a $M \times M$ block matrix, that represents the change of the i-firm's reaction functions with respect to the outputs of j, with:

$$\frac{\partial \overset{*}{\underline{Q}}{}^i}{\partial \underline{Q}^k} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \overset{*}{q}{}_1^i}{\partial q_1^k} & \frac{\partial \overset{*}{q}{}_1^i}{\partial q_2^k} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \overset{*}{q}{}_1^i}{\partial q_M^k} \\ \frac{\partial \overset{*}{q}{}_2^i}{\partial q_1^k} & \frac{\partial \overset{*}{q}{}_2^i}{\partial q_2^k} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \overset{*}{q}{}_2^i}{\partial q_M^k} \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial \overset{*}{q}{}_M^i}{\partial q_1^k} & \frac{\partial \overset{*}{q}{}_M^i}{\partial q_2^k} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \overset{*}{q}{}_M^i}{\partial q_M^k} \end{bmatrix} \tag{3.10}$$

According to our optimal outputs (Eq. 3.6), we have:

$$\frac{\partial \overset{*}{\underline{Q}}{}^i}{\partial \underline{Q}^k} = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2(1+d)} I_{M\times M} & , \text{ for } i \neq j \\ H & , \text{ for } i = j \end{cases} \tag{3.11}$$

where I is the identity matrix and H is a zero-diagonal matrix with all the off-diagonal entries equal to $-d/(1+d)$.

4 Dynamic Analysis of the Equilibrium

For the dynamic modeling, we use naive expectations. Thus, the game is developed on discrete time as follow[3]:

$$q_j^i(t+1) = \frac{a_j - \tilde{Q}_j^i(t) - c^i - 2d\hat{Q}^i(t)}{2\,(1+d)} \tag{4.1}$$

When there are two players competing over M different markets, the long-run map proposed in 4.1 is defining for the following $2m$ equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
q_1^1(t+1) &= \frac{a_1 - q_1^2(t) - c^1 - 2d\left(q_2^1(t) + q_3^1(t) + \ldots + q_M^1(t)\right)}{2\,(1+d)} \\
&\vdots \quad\quad \vdots \\
q_j^1(t+1) &= \frac{a_j - q_j^2(t) - c^1 - 2d\left(q_1^1(t) + \ldots + q_{j-1}^1(t) + q_{j+1}^1(t) \ldots + q_M^1(t)\right)}{2\,(1+d)} \\
&\vdots \quad\quad \vdots \\
q_M^1(t+1) &= \frac{a_M - q_M^2(t) - c^1 - 2d\left(q_1^1(t) + q_3^1(t) + \ldots + q_{M-1}^1(t)\right)}{2\,(1+d)} \\
q_1^2(t+1) &= \frac{a_1 - q_1^1(t) - c^2 - 2d\left(q_2^2(t) + q_3^2(t) + \ldots + q_M^2(t)\right)}{2\,(1+d)} \\
&\vdots \quad\quad \vdots \\
q_j^2(t+1) &= \frac{a_j - q_j^1(t) - c^2 - 2d\left(q_1^2(t) + \ldots + q_{j-1}^2(t) + q_{j+1}^2(t) \ldots + q_M^2(t)\right)}{2\,(1+d)} \\
&\vdots \quad\quad \vdots \\
q_M^2(t+1) &= \frac{a_M - q_M^1(t) - c^2 - 2d\left(q_1^2(t) + q_3^2(t) + \ldots + q_{M-1}^2(t)\right)}{2\,(1+d)}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

The nontrivial Cournot-Nash equilibrium point for the previous set of equations (static solution) is given by:

[3]The dynamic proposed in 4.1 can lead to negative outputs without economic sense. Following [53], we will differentiate between two types of trajectories: admissible and feasible. Calling T the map defined by the $2m$ equations of the game, the set of admissible (S) and feasible points (F) is defined respectively by:

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= \left\{\left(q_1^1, q_2^1, \ldots, q_M^1, q_1^2, q_2^2, \ldots, q_2^M\right) \in R_+^{2M} : T^n\left(q_1^1, q_2^1, \ldots, q_M^1, q_1^2, q_2^2, \ldots, q_2^M\right) \in R^{2M} \quad \forall n > 0\right\} \\
F &= \left\{\left(q_1^1, q_2^1, \ldots, q_M^1, q_1^2, q_2^2, \ldots, q_2^M\right) \in R_+^{2M} : T^n\left(q_1^1, q_2^1, \ldots, q_M^1, q_1^2, q_2^2, \ldots, q_2^M\right) \in R_+^{2M} \quad \forall n > 0\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

Then, the mathematical results are based on the admissible trajectories. However, in the economic context, only the feasible points will be considered.

$$\overset{*}{q}{}_j^i = \frac{\left(a_j - c^i\right)(1+2Md) + c^k - c^i}{3+(2M)^2 d^2 + 8Md} + \frac{2}{3}\frac{M\left(a_j - \bar{a}\right)\left(2Md^2+d\right)}{3+(2M)^2 d^2 + 8Md}, \quad d \neq -\frac{3}{2M}, -\frac{1}{2M} \tag{4.3}$$

Using the equations3.9, 3.10 and 3.11 the Jacobian matrix for the system is defined by:

$$J_{2xM} = \begin{bmatrix} \underbrace{\begin{Bmatrix} 0 & -\frac{d}{1+d} & \cdots & -\frac{d}{1+d} \\ -\frac{d}{1+d} & 0 & \cdots & -\frac{d}{1+d} \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ -\frac{d}{1+d} & -\frac{d}{1+d} & \cdots & 0 \end{Bmatrix}}_{M\text{times}} & \begin{matrix} -\frac{1}{2(1+d)} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2(1+d)} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & -\frac{1}{2(1+d)} \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} -\frac{1}{2(1+d)} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2(1+d)} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & -\frac{1}{2(1+d)} \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 0 & -\frac{d}{1+d} & \cdots & -\frac{d}{1+d} \\ -\frac{d}{1+d} & 0 & \cdots & -\frac{d}{1+d} \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ -\frac{d}{1+d} & -\frac{d}{1+d} & & 0 \end{matrix} \end{bmatrix}_{M\text{times}} \tag{4.4}$$

The characteristic equation of 4.4 takes the form:

$$\left(\lambda - \tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{2d+1}{(1+d)}\right)^{m-1}\left(\lambda - \tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{2d-1}{(1+d)}\right)^{m-1}\left(\lambda + \tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{2(m-1)d+1}{(1+d)}\right)\left(\lambda + \tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{2(m-1)d-1}{(1+d)}\right) = 0 \tag{4.5}$$

Thus, we have four[4] different eigenvalues:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= -\frac{2(m-1)d+1}{2(1+d)} \\ \lambda_2 &= -\frac{2(m-1)d-1}{2(1+d)} \\ \lambda_{3,\ldots,m+1} &= \frac{2d+1}{2(1+d)} \\ \lambda_{m+2,\ldots,2m} &= \frac{2d-1}{2(1+d)} \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

The local stability of equilibrium is achieved only if each eigenvalue is within the unit circle. According to 4.6 this is fulfilled when:

[4]If we fix $M = 1$, we have only the two first eigenvalues.



Figure 4.1: Stabililty zone (blue lines) for a duopoly depending of the number of markets and the values for d.

$$\begin{cases} -\dfrac{1}{2m} < d < \dfrac{1}{2\,(m-2)}, & m \neq 2 \\ d > -\dfrac{1}{4}, & m = 2 \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

By 4.7 is clear that stability of the duopoly game depends on both the scale parameter (d) and the number of markets (m). In the fig. 4.1 the relationship between m and d, in order of to arrive to the stability of the game is shown. When m=1,2 the equilibrium becomes unstable only if d>-1/(2m). However, if m>3, we need to put an upper bound for the stability condition. We see that when the number of markets increases, the stability is achieved only if d tends to zero.

5 Numerical simulations

Using numerical simulations we can see how the complex dynamics of the equilibrium depends on the scale parameter (d), using a scheme of duopolists competing on three markets (2×3 game). The results of our model (blue) will be compared with the base model (red) proposed by Fisher (see section 2) under identical parameter values.

In the figs. 5.1 and 5.2 we show the dynamic of the quantity allocated by player 1 in market 1 according to several values of d.

For $d = -0.1$ and $d = 0.2$ (figs. 5.1b and 5.2a) we have that the equilibrium under naive expectations reaches the equilibrium in both models.

When $d = 0$ (fig. 5.1c), the models no longer have advantages/disadvantages of scale production, being both the same schemes that the Cournot-Teocharis approach (see section 2).

As seen in the fig. 5.2b, for the critical point $d = 1/2$, the dynamic goes to stationary oscillations (neutrally stable) for the retail competition while for the single-market approach arrives quickly to the equilibrium .

For the case of figs. 5.1a and 5.2c the dynamic of the Fisher model remains stable but in our model lead to a chaotic behavior.

The figure 5.3 show the complex dynamic of the the quantity q_1^1 by means of bifurcation diagrams, using values of d from the interval $[-0.17; 0.52]$. The decentralized model shows stability of the equilibrium for all the values examined. By contrast, in our model the chaos is achieved outside the critical points ($d < -1/6$ and $d > 1/2$, as it was predicted by the analytical results of the duopoly case, see eq. 4.7). In the stability zone (fig. 5.3b), we can observe how the centralized managerial decision takes advantage in terms of production when the company operates under economies of scale in relation to the disaggregated model; while at diseconomies of scale, the production performance of the local model are less affected than the multi-market scheme.

6 Conclusions

In this work, we analyze the stability of a multi-store retail competition model. Specifically, we model an oligopoly system with multi-market competition. The model considers the impact of the firm's economies or diseconomies of scale. In one extreme, the multi-store retail maintain a centralized decision making process, optimizing global economies of scale due to its global size. On the other hand, we have local oligopolistic competition, where the same demand is served by different firms that compete in only one market. Our model confirms the fact that economies and diseconomies of scale make the Cournot equilibrium very unstable for certain values of the scale parameter of the producers. Additionally, the number of markets, as expected, tends to contribute to this instability. One very interesting further research is to expand the multi-market oligopolistic model to a multi-product setting.

7 Acknowledgments

Aid from the Fondecyt Program, project N^{o} 1131096, is grateful acknowledged by Marcelo Villena. Axel Araneda thanks as well Faculty of Engineering & Science of the Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez for financial support.

References

[1] Antoine-Augustin Cournot. *Recherches sur les principes mathématiques de la théorie des richesses*. chez L. Hachette, Paris, 1838.

[2] Tönu Puu. Chaos in duopoly pricing. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 1(6):573–581, 1991.



(a) $d = -0.2$



(b) $d = -0.1$



(c) $d = 0$

Figure 5.1: Dynamic of q_1^1 (solid line) and Cuornot equilibrium (dots), for different values of d, under the proposed retail competition (blue) and the Fisher approach (independent sellers) (red); with $a_1 = 200$, $a_2 = 150$, $a_3 = 100$, $c_1 = 20$, $c_2 = 40$.



(a) $d = 0.2$



(b) $d = 0.5$



(c) $d = 0.55$

Figure 5.2: Dynamic of q_1^1 (solid line) and Cuornot equilibrium (dots), for different values of d, under the proposed retail competition (blue) and the Fisher approach (red); with $a_1 = 200$, $a_2 = 150$, $a_3 = 100$, $c_1 = 20$, $c_2 = 40$.



(a) $d \in [-0.17; -0.16]$



(b) $d \in [-0.16; 0.45]$



(c) $d \in [-0.45; 0.52]$

Figure 5.3: Bifurcation diagrams for the quantity of the player 1 over market 1 using the proposed retail competition model (blue) and the Fisher approach (red) with $a_1 = 200$, $a_2 = 150$, $a_3 = 100$, $c_1 = 20$ and $c_2 = 40$.

[3] Tönu Puu. Complex dynamics with three oligopolists. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 7(2):2075–2081, 1996.

[4] Tönu Puu. The chaotic duopolists revisited. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 33(3):385–394, 1998.

[5] SS Askar, Ahmad M Alshamrani, and K Alnowibet. Dynamic cournot duopoly games with nonlinear demand function. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 259:427–437, 2015.

[6] Ahmad K. Naimzada and Lucia Sbragia. Oligopoly games with nonlinear demand and cost functions: Two boundedly rational adjustment processes. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 29(3):707 – 722, 2006.

[7] E Ahmed and HN Agiza. Dynamics of a cournot game with n-competitors. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 9(9):1513–1517, 1998.

[8] Tönu Puu. On the stability of cournot equilibrium when the number of competitors increases. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 66(3):445–456, 2008.

[9] Liang Chen and Guanrong Chen. Controlling chaos in an economic model. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 374(1):349–358, 2007.

[10] Akio Matsumoto. Controlling the cournot-nash chaos. *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, 128(2):379–392, 2006.

[11] Gian Italo Bischi, Ahmad K Naimzada, and Lucia Sbragia. Oligopoly games with local monopolistic approximation. *Journal of economic behavior & organization*, 62(3):371–388, 2007.

[12] Gian Italo Bischi and Michael Kopel. Equilibrium selection in a nonlinear duopoly game with adaptive expectations. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 46(1):73–100, 2001.

[13] Gian Italo Bischi and Fabio Lamantia. Routes to complexity induced by constraints in cournot oligopoly games with linear reaction functions. *Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics & Econometrics*, 16(2), 2012.

[14] HN Agiza, AS Hegazi, and AA Elsadany. Complex dynamics and synchronization of a duopoly game with bounded rationality. *Mathematics and computers in Simulation*, 58(2):133–146, 2002.

[15] LU Yali. Dynamics of a delayed duopoly game with increasing marginal costs and bounded rationality strategy. *Procedia Engineering*, 15:4392–4396, 2011.

[16] HN Agiza and AA Elsadany. Nonlinear dynamics in the cournot duopoly game with heterogeneous players. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 320:512–524, 2003.

[17] HN Agiza and AA Elsadany. Chaotic dynamics in nonlinear duopoly game with heterogeneous players. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 149(3):843–860, 2004.

[18] Natascia Angelini, Roberto Dieci, and Franco Nardini. Bifurcation analysis of a dynamic duopoly model with heterogeneous costs and behavioural rules. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 79(10):3179–3196, 2009.

[19] Junhai Ma and Xiaosong Pu. Complex dynamics in nonlinear triopoly market with different expectations. *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society*, 2011, 2011.

[20] Tomasz Dubiel-Teleszynski. Nonlinear dynamics in a heterogeneous duopoly game with adjusting players and diseconomies of scale. *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, 16(1):296–308, 2011.

[21] Tönu Puu and Anna Norin. Cournot duopoly when the competitors operate under capacity constraints. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 18(3):577–592, 2003.

[22] Tönu Puu and Manuel Ruíz Marín. The dynamics of a triopoly cournot game when the competitors operate under capacity constraints. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 28(2):403–413, 2006.

[23] Fabio Lamantia. A nonlinear duopoly with efficient production-capacity levels. *Computational Economics*, 38(3):295–309, 2011.

[24] Gian-Italo Bischi and Fabio Lamantia. Nonlinear duopoly games with positive cost externalities due to spillover effects. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 13(4):701–721, 2002.

[25] Gian-Italo Bischi and Fabio Lamantia. Chaos synchronization and intermittency in a duopoly game with spillover effects. In *Oligopoly Dynamics*, pages 195–217. Springer, 2002.

[26] Gian Italo Bischi and Fabio Lamantia. A dynamic model of oligopoly with r&d externalities along networks. part ii. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 84:66–82, 2012.

[27] Gian Italo Bischi and Fabio Lamantia. A dynamic model of oligopoly with r&d externalities along networks. part i. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 84:51–65, 2012.

[28] James A Brander. Intra-industry trade in identical commodities. *Journal of international Economics*, 11(1):1–14, 1981.

[29] James Brander and Paul Krugman. A reciprocal dumping model of international trade. *Journal of international economics*, 15(3):313–321, 1983.

[30] Paul Krugman. Import protection as export promotion: International competition in the presence of oligopoly and economies of scale. In Henryk Kierzkowski, editor, *Monopolistic Competition in International Trade*, chapter 11, pages 180–193. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 1984.

[31] Avinash Dixit. International trade policy for oligopolistic industries. *The Economic Journal*, 94:pp. 1–16, 1984.

[32] Elhanan Helpman. Increasing returns, imperfect markets, and trade theory. In R.W. Jones and Kenen P.B., editors, *Handbook of International Economics*, volume 1, pages 325–365. Elsevier Science Publishers B.V., 1984.

[33] Shmuel Ben-Zvi and Elhanan Helpman. Oligopoly in segmented markets. Working Paper 2665, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1988.

[34] Dermot Leahy. Import protection as export promotion in oligopolistic markets with r & d. *The Economic and Social Review*, 23(1):93–103, 1991.

[35] Tracy Murray and Nurlan Turdaliev. Universal dumping of homogeneous products. *Review of International Economics*, 7(4):580–589, 1999.

[36] Jeremy I Bulow, John D Geanakoplos, and Paul D Klemperer. Multimarket oligopoly: Strategic substitutes and complements. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 93(3):488–511, 1985.

[37] B Douglas Bernheim and Michael D Whinston. Multimarket contact and collusive behavior. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 21(1):1–26, 1990.

[38] Corwin D Edwards. Conglomerate bigness as a source of power. In *Business concentration and price policy*, NBER Conference report, pages 331–359. Princeton University Press, 1955.

[39] Fang Wu and Junhai Ma. The chaos dynamic of multiproduct cournot duopoly game with managerial delegation. *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society*, 2014, 2014.

[40] E Ahmed and MF Elettreby. Controls of the complex dynamics of a multi-market cournot model. *Economic Modelling*, 37:251–254, 2014.

[41] Joaquín Andaluz and Gloria Jarne. On the dynamics of economic games based on product differentiation. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 113:16–27, 2015.

[42] AK Naimzada and Fabio Tramontana. Dynamic properties of a cournot–bertrand duopoly game with differentiated products. *Economic Modelling*, 29(4):1436–1439, 2012.

[43] Juan Carlos Barcena-Ruiz and Maria Paz Espinosa. Should multiproduct firms provide divisional or corporate incentives? *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 17(5):751–764, 1999.

[44] Yingyi Qian and Chenggang Xu. Why china's economic reforms differ: the m-form hierarchy and entry/expansion of the non-state sector. *The Economics of Transition*, 1(2):135–170, 1993.

[45] Reghinos D Theocharis. On the stability of the cournot solution on the oligopoly problem. *Review of Economic Studies*, 27(2):133–134, 1959.

[46] Tord Palander. Instability in competition between two sellers. In *papers presented at the research conference on economics and statistics held by the Cowles Commission at Colorado College, Colorado College Publications, General Series*, number 208, 1936.

[47] Tönu Puu. Rational expectations and the cournot-theocharis problem. *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society*, 2006, 2006.

[48] José S Cánovas, Tönu Puu, and Manuel Ruíz. The cournot–theocharis problem reconsidered. *aaaa*, 37(4):1025–1039, 2008.

[49] Franklin M Fisher. The stability of the cournot oligopoly solution: The effects of speeds of adjustment and increasing marginal costs. *The Review of Economic Studies*, pages 125–135, 1961.

[50] Jian-guo Du, Tingwen Huang, and Zhaohan Sheng. Analysis of decision-making in economic chaos control. *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 10(4):2493–2501, 2009.

[51] Hong-Xing Yao and Feng Xu. Complex dynamics analysis for a duopoly advertising model with nonlinear cost. *Applied mathematics and computation*, 180(1):134–145, 2006.

[52] EM Elabbasy, HN Agiza, and AA Elsadany. Analysis of nonlinear triopoly game with heterogeneous players. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 57(3):488–499, 2009.

[53] Anna Agliari and Tönu Puu. A cournot duopoly with bounded inverse demand function. In Tönu Puu, , and Irina Sushko, editors, *Oligopoly Dynamics*, pages 171–194. Springer, 2002.